

**STRATEGIC SCHOOL PROFILE 2004-05**

**Regional School District 17**  
**GARY S MALA, Superintendent**

Telephone: (860) 345-4534




---

This profile was produced by the Connecticut State Department of Education in accordance with CT General Statutes 10-220(c).

---

**COMMUNITY DATA**

County: Middlesex	Public School Enrollment as a Percent of Town Population: 18.2%
2000 Population: 13,175	Public School Enrollment as % of Total Student Population: 91.3%
1990-2000 Population Growth: 13.7%	Percent of Adults without a High School Diploma in 2000: 8.8%
2000 Per Capita Income: \$31,163	Adult Education Enrollment in 2003-04 School Year: 17
Number of Public Schools: 5	Number of Adults Receiving Diplomas in 2003-04 School Yr.: 9
Number of Nonpublic Schools: 0	

---

Education Reference Group (ERG): C ERG is a classification of districts whose students' families are similar in education, income, occupation, and need, and that have roughly similar enrollment.

---

**DISTRICT NEED**

<b>Current and Past District Need</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
% of Students Eligible for Free/Reduced-Price Meals	2004-2005	3.6	4.7	26.6
	2002-2003	2.6	4.2	25.4
% of K-12 Students with Non-English Home Language	2004-2005	0.4	1.7	12.5
	1999-2000	0.5	1.9	12.3
% of Elementary and Middle School Students above Entry Gr. who Attended this School the Previous Yr.	2004-2005	85.1	92.9	89.0
	1999-2000	81.4	91.0	86.3
% of Kindergarten Students who Attended Preschool, Nursery School, or Headstart	2004-2005	94.2	84.4	77.0
	1999-2000	84.4	82.9	73.1
% of Juniors and Seniors Working More Than 16 Hours Per Week	2004-2005	19.2	22.4	22.1
	1999-2000	35.9	29.8	30.4

**STUDENT ENROLLMENT AND RACE/ETHNICITY**

<b>Enrollment</b>	
Grade Range	PK-12
Total Enrollment	2,401
5-Year Enrollment Change	2.5%
Projected 2009 Enrollment	
Elementary	1,347
Middle School	386
High School	671
Prekindergarten, Other	24

<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Percent</b>
American Indian	5	0.2
Asian American	35	1.5
Black	19	0.8
Hispanic	23	1.0
White	2,319	96.6
Total Minority 2004-2005	82	3.4
Total Minority 1999-2000	93	4.0

### **EFFORTS TO REDUCE RACIAL, ETHNIC, AND ECONOMIC ISOLATION**

Connecticut law requires that school districts provide educational opportunities for its students to interact with students and teachers from diverse racial, ethnic, and economic backgrounds. This may occur through magnet school programs, public school choice programs, charter schools, minority staff recruitment, inter- or intradistrict programs and projects, distance learning, or other experiences. Below is the description submitted by this school district of how it provides such experiences.

Despite the fact that Regional School District No. 17 has experienced limitations in the past for diversity, we have continually sought out opportunities for students aimed at reducing racial, ethnic and economic isolation. Specifically, numerous assembly programs with diversity and tolerance as the major theme have been incorporated into all of the schools in the district. Efforts such as field trips designed to expose students of the district to various cultures are supported and have been increased in frequency. Recent activities have included expanding the student exchange programs in place in the district for the sole purpose of developing a more diverse student body.

The school district continues to maintain a mentor program, School-To-Career program, university and college cooperatives and internship experiences for the purpose of allowing the students to interact and simulate real life experiences. Most recently, the district has met the challenges associated with providing direct services to English as a Second Language students whose enrollment has increased markedly during the past year. At the middle school and elementary levels, there are numerous activities that connect the schools in Regional School District No. 17 with those in urban centers. Continued participation in the "Don't Laugh At Me" program and the "Book Exchange" program exists within the district and has been supplemented with pen pal and electronic communication activities between Regional School District No. 17 students and students throughout the State of Connecticut and beyond.

### **DISTRICT RESOURCES**

#### **Staff Count (Full-Time Equivalent)**

# of Certified Staff

Teachers	196.1
Administrators	11.0
Department Chairs	0.0
Library/Media Staff	1.0
Other Professionals	20.3
% Minority 2004-2005	2.1
% Minority 1999-2000	0.5
# Non-Certified Instructional	46.6



<b>Average Class Size</b>		<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
Grade K	2004-2005	15.8	16.7	18.5
	1999-2000	16.8	16.9	18.5
Grade 2	2004-2005	16.5	18.2	19.5
	1999-2000	16.3	18.6	19.8
Grade 5	2004-2005	19.3	20.6	21.3
	1999-2000	22.1	20.8	21.8
Grade 7	2004-2005	19.1	19.8	20.9
	1999-2000	18.4	20.3	21.9
High School	2004-2005	20.3	18.8	20.2
	1999-2000	18.6	18.3	20.0

<b>Professional Staff Experience and Training</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
Average Number of Years Experience in Connecticut	14.5	13.6	13.2
% with Master's Degree or Above	79.1	79.1	78.5
% Trained as Mentors, Assessors, or Cooperating Teachers	29.8	31.7	27.7

**DISTRICT RESOURCES, continued**

<b>Total Hours of Instruction Per Yr.*</b>	<b>Dist</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
Elementary	1,012	993	987
Middle School	1,020	1,020	1,014
High School	952	1,017	1,003

\*State law requires at least 900 hours for gr. 1-12 and full-day kindergarten, and 450 hours for half-day kindergarten.

<b>Resource Ratios</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
Students Per Academic Computer	4.5	3.4	3.6
Students Per Teacher	12.2	13.4	13.8
Teachers Per Administrator	17.8	14.3	13.9

**STUDENT PERFORMANCE**

<b>Physical Fitness</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
% Passing All 4 Tests	37.0	41.0	35.2

**Connecticut Mastery Test, Third Generation, % Meeting State Goal:** The state goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.

<b>Connecticut Mastery Test, 3<sup>rd</sup> Generation % Meeting State Goal</b>	<b>District 2004-05</b>	<b>ERG 2004-05</b>	<b>State 2004-05</b>
Grade 4 Reading	60.8	65.1	52.8
Writing	64.7	71.6	63.3
Mathematics	61.8	65.8	56.8
All Three Tests	42.6	51.4	41.2
Grade 6 Reading	77.2	76.2	60.5
Writing	69.8	73.5	61.3
Mathematics	76.2	75.4	60.9
All Three Tests	56.4	59.2	45.3
Grade 8 Reading	78.6	78.4	64.9
Writing	69.2	72.7	60.7
Mathematics	67.4	70.5	55.7
All Three Tests	54.5	59.2	45.2
Participation Rate	99.8	99.4	99.0



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, these results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district.

## STUDENT PERFORMANCE, continued

**Connecticut Academic Performance Test, Second Generation, % Meeting State Goal:** The state Goal was established with the advice and assistance of a cross section of Connecticut educators. Students receive certification of mastery for each area in which they meet or exceed the Goal. The Goal level is more demanding than the state Proficient level, but not as high as the Advanced level, reported in the No Child Left Behind Report Cards.


<b>Conn. Academic Performance Test, 2<sup>nd</sup> Generation</b> % Grade 10 Meeting State Goal	<b>District</b> <b>2004-05</b>	<b>ERG</b> <b>2004-05</b>	<b>State</b> <b>2004-05</b>
Reading Across the Disciplines	61.7	66.7	48.9
Writing Across the Disciplines	72.1	70.4	55.2
Mathematics	57.9	65.7	47.8
Science	62.4	68.6	47.3
All Four Tests	39.7	45.3	29.2
Participation Rate	100.0	98.1	96.8



The figures above were calculated differently than those reported in the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Report Cards. Unlike NCLB figures, these results reflect the performance of students with scoreable tests who were enrolled in the district at the time of testing, regardless of the length of time they were enrolled in the district.

<b>SAT<sup>®</sup> I: Reasoning Test</b>	<b>Class of 1999</b>	<b>Class of 2004</b>		
	<b>District</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
% of Graduates Tested	88.7	84.8	82.1	74.8
Mathematics: Average Score	543	534	532	508
Mathematics: % Scoring 600 or More	32.4	25.4	26.1	23.3
Verbal: Average Score	546	542	538	508
Verbal: % Scoring 600 or More	31.4	31.3	27.5	22.0

<b>Dropout Rates</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
Cumulative Four-Year Rate for Class of 2004	0.0	4.3	8.8
2003-04 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.0	1.1	1.8
1998-99 Annual Rate for Grades 9 through 12	0.3	1.7	3.3

Activities of Graduates	Class of	# in District	District %	ERG %	State %
 Pursuing Higher Education	2004	127	80.4	86.1	81.5
	1999	98	85.2	81.8	78.3
Employed or in Military	2004	24	15.2	10.5	14.1
	1999	17	14.8	14.4	17.1
Unemployed	2004	0	0.0	0.3	0.8
	1999	0	0.0	0.7	0.9

## DISTRICT REVENUES/EXPENDITURES 2003-04

Expenditures may be supported by local tax revenues, state grants, federal grants, municipal in-kind services, tuition and other sources. ERG and state figures will not be comparable to the district if the school district does not teach both elementary and secondary students.

<b>Expenditures</b> All figures are unaudited.	<b>Total</b> <b>(in 1000s)</b>	<b>Expenditures Per Pupil</b>			
		<b>District</b>	<b>PK-12 Districts</b>	<b>ERG</b>	<b>State</b>
Instructional Staff and Services	\$14,734	\$6,173	\$6,287	\$5,928	\$6,282
Instructional Supplies and Equipment	\$679	\$285	\$242	\$223	\$242
Improvement of Instruction and Educational Media Services	\$910	\$381	\$398	\$354	\$387
Student Support Services	\$1,535	\$643	\$616	\$633	\$615
Administration and Support Services	\$2,472	\$1,036	\$1,092	\$1,069	\$1,101
Plant Operation and Maintenance	\$2,721	\$1,140	\$1,031	\$990	\$1,025
Transportation	\$1,573	\$646	\$485	\$512	\$487
Costs for Students Tuitioned Out	\$462	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other	\$356	\$149	\$122	\$123	\$120
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$25,442</b>	<b>\$10,623</b>	<b>\$10,518</b>	<b>\$10,082</b>	<b>\$10,479</b>
<b>Additional Expenditures</b>					
Land, Buildings, and Debt Service	\$2,460	\$1,031	\$1,149	\$1,580	\$1,171
Adult Education	\$48	\$2,824	N/A	\$872	\$1,057

**Revenue Sources, % from Source.** Revenue sources do not include state funded Teachers' Retirement Board contributions, vocational-technical school operations, SDE budgeted costs for salaries and leadership activities and other state-funded school districts (e.g., Dept. of Children and Families and Dept. of Corrections).

<b>District Expenditures</b>	<b>Local Revenue</b>	<b>State Revenue</b>	<b>Federal Revenue</b>	<b>Tuition &amp; Other</b>
With School Construction	80.9	17.6	1.5	0.1
Without School Construction	85.6	12.7	1.6	0.1

**Selected Regular Education Expenditures, Amount Per Pupil and Percent Change from Prior Year.** Selected regular education expenditures exclude costs of special education and land, building, and debt service.

<b>Expenditures by Grade Level</b>	<b>District</b>		<b>ERG</b>		<b>State</b>	
	<b>Per Pupil</b>	<b>% Change</b>	<b>Per Pupil</b>	<b>% Change</b>	<b>Per Pupil</b>	<b>% Change</b>
<b>Elementary and Middle</b>						
Total	\$8,463	2.3	\$7,939	2.7	\$8,620	3.8
Salaries and Benefits	\$7,206	4.0	\$6,537	4.3	\$7,120	4.0
Supplies	\$556	10.1	\$415	-2.4	\$455	5.6
Equipment	\$202	-14.0	\$99	-23.8	\$114	-8.8
<b>High School</b>						
Total	\$11,863	5.4	\$9,456	3.7	\$9,316	1.3
Salaries and Benefits	\$9,148	8.4	\$7,466	4.9	\$7,529	1.7
Supplies	\$1,274	19.4	\$552	2.0	\$524	4.0
Equipment	\$350	-42.1	\$114	-29.2	\$133	-13.1

## **EQUITABLE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES AMONG DISTRICT SCHOOLS**

Below is the description submitted by this district of how it allocates resources to insure equity and address needs.

The Board of Education recognizes the importance of good planning in determining the distribution of district resources and is committed to providing equitable resources for all district schools. To ensure this commitment is met, all requests for appropriation of resources begin at the school level. Staff at each school determines the overall needs and plans a budget to show the identified goals, past performances, current needs and budget priorities. Decision packages are used for all proposals which cannot be met with the allocated dollars given to each school. This process provides the means for meeting specific needs (i.e. increases in staffing based on student growth, new programs, etc.) Once budget proposals at the building level are complete, Central Office staff meet with building administrators to determine the overall priorities in the district and submit a proposed budget to the Board of Education. This budget is articulated by program and by school to allow the Board and the community to understand all components in the equitable distribution of resources. Throughout this process there are opportunities for community input and information prior to a district referendum on the budget.

In addition to public input sessions during the budget development cycle, the Board of Education has created a system for strategic planning that incorporates the use of "focus groups" to ensure that every constituent group has an equal say in expressing what they believe should be included in the district operating and capital budget.

---

## **EVIDENCE OF SUSTAINED IMPROVEMENTS IN STUDENT ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

---

Below is a summary, submitted by this school district, of the major trends in student performance and accomplishments that indicate sustained improvement over time. Also, areas of need are identified and plans to address these needs are presented.

Haddam-Killingworth students continue to score well above the State average on State tests. CAPT and CMT scores rose slightly this year, with the exception of mathematics at the elementary level. SAT scores declined slightly. This year, 80% of the students took the SATs with an average verbal score of 537, an average math score of 518, and a combined score of 1,055. Students enrolled in AP courses had an average score of 3.8.

Staff members at all levels studied the results of CMT and CAPT tests in depth again this year. School improvement plans were driven by analyzing the strengths and weaknesses of student skills and addressing those areas for improvement. With varying results on a year-by-year basis, the district is looking for more consistency of improvement at all grades in all content areas. As a means to that end, data teams have been formed in each building in the district whose purpose is to monitor a variety of data points to determine overall rate of success. Among these data points are attendance, grade distribution by grade placement and content area as compared to student performance on standardized measures, student achievement levels on benchmark assessments utilized in all grades, and other similar sources. Significant professional development has targeted differentiated instruction, instructional practices where research has revealed effectiveness, learning styles, and strategies for effective instruction in English Language Arts and Mathematics.

Strategic School Profiles may be viewed on the internet at [www.state.ct.us/sde](http://www.state.ct.us/sde). A more detailed, searchable SSP database, data tables, and additional CT education facts are also available at this site.

For the school district website, see [www.rsd17.k12.ct.us/](http://www.rsd17.k12.ct.us/)